



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/808,499      | 03/25/2004  | Hidekazu Miyairi     | 0756-7275           | 5721             |

31780 7590 07/22/2010  
Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
3975 Fair Ridge Drive  
Suite 20 North  
Fairfax, VA 22033

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WEST, JEFFREY R

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2857

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

07/22/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/808,499

**Applicant(s)**

MIYAIRI ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jeffrey R. West

**Art Unit**

2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/01/10
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are  
1,3,11,18,26,28,32,34,37,39,42,44,45,47,50,52,53,55,58,60,69,71,74,76,77,79 and 82.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are  
1,3,11,18,26,28,32,34,37,39,42,44,45,47,50,52,53,55,58,60,69,71,74,76,77,79 and 82.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 28, 2010, has been entered.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. In response to Applicant's indication that "the Applicant has not received acknowledgment of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 1, 2010", the Examiner asserts that the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on March

01, 2010, was considered by the Examiner and mailed with an Advisory Action on May 25, 2010. Please also find a courtesy copy of the initialed IDS of March 01, 2010, attached to the instant Office Action.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities:

To avoid confusion between the "approximate line" determined from "average values of corrected saturations" (claim 1) and the "approximate line" determined from "average values of luminances" (claim 11), in claim 11, line 5, "obtaining an approximate line" should be something similar to ---obtaining a second approximate line--- and in claim 11, line 8, "the approximate line" should be something similar to - --the second approximate line---.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3, 11, 18, 26, 28, 32, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 50, 52, 53, 55, 58, 60, 69, 71, 74, 76, 77, 79, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is considered to be vague and indefinite because line 17 refers to "a demanded performance of the semiconductor element" while there is no previous mention of any "semiconductor element" making it unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether "a demanded performance of the semiconductor element" is to refer to a performance of the previously presented "semiconductor film" or an actual "semiconductor element" that comprises the "semiconductor film".

Independent claims 3, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because they contain recitations of "the semiconductor element" similar to that of claim 1.

Claim 37 is considered to be vague and indefinite because it attempts to further limit parent claim 1 "wherein the visible light is irradiated from a light source selected from the group...". Claim 1, however, specifies "irradiating an energy beam" and not "visible light" making it unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether or not the "visible light" is the same as the "energy beam".

Claims 39, 42, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because they contain recitations of "the visible light is irradiated" similar to that of claim 37.

Claim 45 is considered to be vague and indefinite because it attempts to further limit parent claim 1 "wherein an illumination intensity of the visible light irradiating on a surface of the semiconductor film is 10,000 lux or more". Claim 1, however,

specifies "irradiating an energy beam" and not "visible light" making it unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether or not the "visible light" is the same as the "energy beam".

Claims 47, 50, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because they contain recitations of "the visible light irradiating" similar to that of claim 45.

Claim 77 is considered to be vague and indefinite because it attempts to further limit parent claim 1 "wherein a means for photographing the scattered light is provided in a crystallization chamber" while there is no previous mention of any "scattered light" making it unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art as to what "the scattered light" refers.

Claims 79 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because they contain recitations of "the scattered light" similar to that of claim 77.

Claims 11, 18, 32, 34, 53, 55, 58, 60, 69, 71, 74, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because they incorporate the lack of clarity present in their respective parent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 34, 39, 71, and 79, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0016349 to Tsumura et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0031249 to Komuro et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0041226 to Tanaka et al.

With respect to claim 3, Tsumura discloses a method for testing comprising irradiating a visible light on a surface of a semiconductor film (0027, lines 1-9), the semiconductor film having a crystallinity that has been improved by irradiating an energy beam (0063, lines 1-17); photo-transferring a scattered light of the irradiated visible light to form an image (0097, lines 1-16), analyzing regions of the image to discriminate regions of luminance (0091, lines 1-12) and comparing values of luminances with a reference value which is determined for a demanded performance of the semiconductor element in order to evaluate the crystallinity of the semiconductor film having the crystallinity that has been improved (0076, lines 1-12).

With respect to claim 34, Tsumura discloses wherein the energy beam is a laser light (0111, lines 1-4).

With respect to claim 39, Tsumura discloses wherein the visible light is irradiated from a light source selected from the group consisting of a metal halide lamp, a



halogen lamp, a tungsten lamp, a xenon lamp, a light emitting diode, and a fluorescent lamp (i.e. halogen lamp) (0098, lines 1-13).

With respect to claim 71, Tsumura discloses a manufacturing method of a semiconductor device, comprising: testing each of a plurality of semiconductor films crystallized by an energy beam (0088, lines 1-11) having different densities by the method for testing (0107, lines 1-6) and determining an irradiation energy density by a result of the testing to crystallize the semiconductor film (0107, lines 1-6 and 0110, line 1 to 0111, line 4).

Tsumura also discloses a method for testing a beam profile comprising irradiating an energy beam on a substrate on which an amorphous semiconductor film (0043, lines 1-5) is formed (0063, lines 1-17), irradiating a visible light on a surface of the substrate (0027, lines 1-9) and photo-transferring the scattered light to form an image (0097, lines 1-16), analyzing regions of the image to discriminate regions of luminance (0091, lines 1-12) to test a profile of the energy beam (0088, lines 1-11, 0107, lines 1-6, and 0110, line 1 to 0111, line 4) and comparing values of luminances with a reference value which is determined for a demanded performance of the semiconductor element in order to evaluate the crystallinity of the semiconductor film having the crystallinity that has been improved (0076, lines 1-12).

As noted above, the invention of Tsumura teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura does teach determining acceptance based on comparing values of luminances with a reference value which is determined for a demanded performance of the semiconductor element in order to

evaluate the crystallinity of the semiconductor film having the crystallinity that has been improved wherein the determining is based on determining locations on the surface of the film on the basis of a histogram (0076, lines 1-12), and while Tsumura does specify that the beam source is set at an angle with respect to the perpendicular (0067, lines 1-7), Tsumura does not include the specifics on how the angle of the beam source is set.

Komuro teaches a defect detecting apparatus comprising irradiating a visible light on a surface of a semiconductor (0061, lines 1-12) to produce a digital image by using a camera (0061, lines 4-8) to take a visible light dark field photograph (0087, lines 1-18), of a semiconductor film (0004, lines 1-5 and 0061, lines 4-8), and calculating an average luminance of the digital image (0063, lines 1-20 and 0069, lines 1-11) by sectioning basic units consisting of  $m$  rows and  $n$  columns by dividing the digital image into  $n$  in the X direction and  $m$  in the Y direction in a predetermined analysis range (0092, lines 1-16 and 0149, lines 1-17), calculating/testing average values of luminances of the  $n$  basic units aligned in the X direction per each of the  $m$  rows aligned in the Y direction (0063, lines 1-20 and 0069, lines 1-11), obtaining an approximate line (i.e. graph) from relations between the positions in the Y direction and the average values of the luminance corresponding to the positions in the Y direction (Figure 4), and comparing a fluctuation obtained from relations between the approximate line and the average values of the luminance with a reference value which is determined for a demanded beam performance (i.e. compare the fluctuation

of the graph to a maximum allowed luminance reference value) (0063, lines 1-20, 0069, lines 1-11, 0088, lines 1-25, and Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura to include the specifics on how the angle of the beam source is set, as taught by Komuro, because Komuro suggests a corresponding method for setting the angle of the beam source applicable to the defect detection invention of Tsumura, that would have improved the system of Tsumura by allowing setting of the beam source to an angle that will produce a desired luminance for crystallization, for example, a maximum luminance (0063, lines 1-20, 0069, lines 1-11, 0088, lines 1-25, and Figure 4).

As noted above, the invention of Tsumura and Komuro teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura and Komuro does teach calculating average values of the luminance corresponding to the positions in the Y direction of a surface scanned by an energy beam, the combination does not explicitly indicate that the measurement is to be performed in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction of the light.

Tanaka teaches a method and device for exposure control comprising scanning reticle stage in an x-direction using a light source (0129, lines 1-13), receiving reflected light (0131, lines 1-7) and measuring a distribution of luminance (0321, lines 1-8) wherein the measurement is performed in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction of the light (0322, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura and Komuro to explicitly indicate that the measurement is to be performed in a direction perpendicular to the scanning direction of the light, as taught by Tanaka, because, as suggested by Tanaka, the combination would have improved the measurement of Tsumura and Komuro by canceling any irregularity of luminance measured in the scanning direction caused by the scanning itself (0322, lines 1-5).

With respect to claim 79, since the invention of Tsumura teaches performing testing by employing a plurality of components in a crystallization chamber/container (0060, lines 1-7) and the invention of Komuro teaches including a means for photographing the scattered light as part of the components for testing, the combination would have provided a means for photographing the scattered light in a crystallization chamber.

9. Claims 1, 11, 18, 32, 37, 69, and 77, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al. and Tanaka et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0228526 to Lin et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro and Tanaka teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka does teach measuring averages of luminance of an image to determine variations of a surface illuminated by a multi-color light source (Tsumura;

0098, lines 1-3), the combination does not specify determining a corrected saturation value for the image.

Lin teaches a system and method for color characterization using fuzzy pixel classification with application in color matching and color match location comprising means for inspecting a surface of an object (0003, lines 7-12) by dividing an image into regions of interest (0038, lines 1-12) and measuring a saturation value for the image (0112, lines 1-15) that has been corrected/normalized to a range from 0 to 255 (0110, lines 8-11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka to specify determining a corrected saturation value for the image, as taught by Lin, because the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka does teach measuring averages of luminance of an image to determine variations of a surface illuminated by a multi-color light source and Lin suggests a corresponding method that would have improved the inspection method of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka by determining saturation values useful in inspecting colored surfaces, such as the surface colored by the multi-color light source of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka, and provided increased accuracy in surface inspection by measuring saturation values that provide more information regarding color variations (0004, lines 1-10 and 0006, line 1 to 0007, line 8).

10. Claims 47 and 55, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al. and

Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro and Tanaka teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka does teach applying a visible light to the surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Komuro and Tanaka does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka (0052, lines 1-9).

11. Claims 45 and 53, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al. Tanaka,

and Lin and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin does teach applying a visible light to the surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin (0052, lines 1-9).

12. Claims 28, 44, and 76, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al. and Tanaka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,861,614 to Tanabe et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro and Tanaka teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka does teach a method for testing a beam profile by irradiating a laser energy beam on a substrate on which an amorphous semiconductor film is formed, the combination does not specify that the laser is applied as a pulse.

Tanabe teaches an S-System for the formation of a silicon thin film and a semiconductor-insulating film interface comprising performing laser-induced crystallization using a laser pulse (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka to specify that the laser is applied as a pulse, as taught by Tanabe, because the combination, as suggested by Tanabe, would have provided a conventional method to enable one having ordinary skill in the art to carry out the crystallization improvement of Tsumura, Komuro, and Tanaka thereby providing results in accordance with convention (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

13. Claims 26, 42, 74, and 82, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al., Tanaka, and Lin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,861,614 to Tanabe et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of Tsumura,



Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin does teach a method for testing a beam profile by irradiating a laser energy beam on a substrate on which an amorphous semiconductor film is formed, the combination does not specify that the laser is applied as a pulse.

Tanabe teaches an S-System for the formation of a silicon thin film and a semiconductor-insulating film interface comprising performing laser-induced crystallization using a laser pulse (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin to specify that the laser is applied as a pulse, as taught by Tanabe, because the combination, as suggested by Tanabe, would have provided a conventional method to enable one having ordinary skill in the art to carry out the crystallization improvement of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Lin thereby providing results in accordance with convention (column 2, lines 1-14 and column 20, line 60 to column 21, line 10).

14. Claims 52 and 60, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al., Tanaka, and Tanabe and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro, Tanaka, and Tanabe teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of

Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Tanabe does teach applying a visible light to the surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Tanabe to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Tanabe does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, and Tanabe (0052, lines 1-9).

15. Claims 50 and 58, as may best be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsumura et al. in view of Komuro et al., Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142298 to Ujihara et al.

As noted above, Tsumura in combination with Komuro, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe teaches many of the features of the claimed invention and while the invention of

Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe does teach applying a visible light to the surface of a semiconductor film, the visible light being the light from a halogen source, the combination does not specify the output of the halogen source.

Ujihara teaches an inspection method and inspection system of a surface of an article through the inspection of a photographed image of its surface (0002, lines 1-3) in order to determine the illumination variations of the surface, wherein the surface is illuminated by a light source (0009, lines 1-13) such as a halogen lamp with an intensity of 20,000 to 100,000 lux (0052, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe to specify a corresponding output of the halogen source, as taught by Ujihara, because the combination of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe does teach implementing a halogen light source and Ujihara suggests a corresponding intensity range suitable for a halogen lamp to carry out the inspection of Tsumura, Komuro, Tanaka, Lin, and Tanabe (0052, lines 1-9).

### ***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 11, 18, 26, 28, 32, 34, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 47, 50, 52, 53, 55, 58, 60, 69, 71, 74, 76, 77, 79, and 82 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,051,834 to Kakibayashi et al. teaches an electron microscope for analyzing a film surface using dark field photography.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059896 to Yamaguchi et al. teaches an optical processing apparatus and optical processing method.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0203219 to Kasahara et al. teaches a laser apparatus and laser annealing method.

JP Patent Application Publication No. 2000-114174 to Hiroyuki teaches manufacture of semiconductor film, manufacture of thin-film transistor, active substrate and annealing equipment.

JP Patent Application Publication No. 2002-217107 to Wada et al. teaches method of evaluating polysilicon, thin film transistor manufacturing system and method of the same.

JP Patent Application Publication No. 2000-031229 to Terada teaches inspection method of semiconductor thin film and manufacture of semiconductor thin film by use thereof.

U.S. Patent No. 5,835,614 to Aoyama et al. teaches an image processing apparatus.

U.S. Patent No. 5,091,963 to Litt et al. teaches a method and apparatus for inspecting surfaces for contrast variations.

U.S. Patent No. 6,836,532 to Durst et al. teaches a diffraction system for biological crystal screening.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. West whose telephone number is (571)272-2226. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on (571)272-7925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey R. West/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2857

July 20, 2010